

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the Office Action mailed April 20, 2006.

Claims 45-58 are pending in this application. Claims 45-50 and 55-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over European Patent Application 0977142 to Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V. (hereinafter referred to as “Philips”) in view of British Patent Application 2237160 to Cheetah International Limited (hereinafter referred to as “Cheetah”). Claims 51-54, 57, and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Philips in view of Cheetah and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,964,837 to Collier (hereinafter referred to as Collier). Claims 55-57 were objected to as being misnumbered.

Reconsideration and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested in view of the remarks below.

Claims 55-57 – Objections

Claims 55-57 were objected to as being misnumbered. Applicant has re-numbered these claims as 56-58 to reflect the proper numbering. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the objection to re-numbered claims 56-58.

Claims 45-50 and 55-57 – § 103(a)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 45-50 and 55-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Philips in view of Cheetah.

To sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the combined references must teach or suggest each and every element of the claim. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2142.

Because the combination of Philips and Cheetah do not teach or suggest “a receiver disposed within said housing and operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of said remotely-controlled device” as recited in claim 45, claim 45 is patentable over the combined references. As noted in the Office Action, Philips does not teach or suggest “a receiver disposed within said housing and operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of said remotely-controlled device.” *See* Office Action, p.2. Further,

Cheetah does not teach or suggestion “a receiver disposed within said housing and operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of said remotely-controlled device.” Cheetah teaches incorporating a radio receiver into a joystick for receiving commercially-broadcast radio stations, such as a radio station that transmits music or news. *See* Cheetah, Page 2, Line 22, to Page 3, Line 12. Cheetah also teaches incorporating an infra-red transmitter. *See* Cheetah, Page 2, Lines 15-16. But, Cheetah does not teach or suggest incorporating “a receiver disposed within said housing and operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of said remotely-controlled device.” Thus, the combined references do not teach or suggest “a receiver disposed within said housing and operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of said remotely-controlled device” as recited in claim 45. Therefore, claim 45 is patentable over the combined references, and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 45.

Because claims 46-50 and 55-57 depend from and further limit claim 45, claims 46-50 and 55-57 are patentable over the combination of Philips and Cheetah for at least the same reason. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 46-50 and 55-57.

Claims 51-54, 57, and 58 – § 103(a)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 51-54, 57, and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Philips in view of Cheetah and further in view of Collier.

To sustain a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the combined references must teach or suggest each and every element of the claim. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2142.

Because the combination of Philips, Cheetah, and Collier does not teach or suggest “a receiver disposed within said housing and operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of said remotely-controlled device” as recited in claim 45, the claims from which 51-54, 57, and 58 depend, claims 51-54, 57, and 58 are patentable over the combined references. As pointed out above, the combination of Philips and Cheetah does not teach or suggest “a receiver disposed within said housing and operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of said remotely-controlled device.” Collier does not cure this

deficiency. Collier discloses a remote-controlled vehicle which is capable of generating sounds based on the car colliding with an obstacle, rolling over, or other occurrences. The sounds are generated by a system within the vehicle. There is no teaching of a receiver within the controller capable of receiving sensor signals. Therefore, the combination of Philips, Cheetah, and Collier do not teach or suggest "a receiver disposed within said housing and operable to receive a sensor signal from a sensor configured to sense a state of said remotely-controlled device" as recited in claim 45.

Because claims 51-54, 57, and 58 depend from and further limit claim 45, claims 51-54, 57, and 58 are patentable over the combination of Philips, Cheetah, and Collier. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 51-54, 57, and 58.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully asserts that in view of the amendments and remarks above, all pending claims are allowable and Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of all claims.

Should the Examiner have any comments, questions, or suggestions of a nature necessary to expedite the prosecution of the application, or to place the case in condition for allowance, the Examiner is courteously requested to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Date: 7/19/2006

Respectfully submitted,



Carl Sanders
Reg. No. 57,203

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1001 West Fourth Street
Winston-Salem, NC 27101
(336) 607-7474 (voice)
(336) 734-2629 (fax)